HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 44 Wednesday, November 4, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

STRIKE: *A peril to national security*.....(page 1)
ROCKEFELLER: *Midwest mistakes*.....(page 2)
DE GAULLE: *Head of a continental coalition*..(page 2)
SMEAR: *Drew Pearson retracts*.....(page 3)
TAXES: *Revolt in the wind?*.....(page 4)

USW Vs USA: Even after 25 years of bitter experience with pro-labor boss New Dealism, Washington was shocked by the Supreme Court's abrupt denial of the Federal Government's pleas for a speed-up in the steel strike case. "The United Steel Workers v. United States" —so ran the title of the three-line Supreme Court denial, without any explanation of the action by the Nine in black robes. After all, the Solicitor General of the United States presented the plea and cited the President's view that continuation of the strike would imperil the safety of the United States. And T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, added that a key rocket program "is now being set back by shortages resulting from the steel strike."

All observers in the Capital are agreed that the Steelworkers union is engaging in a stalling operation to delay enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act injunction (granted by the lower courts) which would send the striking workers back to their jobs for an 80-day cooling-off period. The Earl Warren Court, whatever its reasons for the curt denial of the Federal Government plea for a speed-up in procedure, is certainly doing nothing so far to interfere with this union plan of procrastination.

Meanwhile, a number of intriguing aspects of the steel situation not mentioned generally in the press drew animated discussion on Capitol Hill:

(1) Steel companies got laurels for their unity and cooperation in face of the inflationary pressures from the United Steelworkers union—all save Kaiser, who ran out at the eleventh hour affording psychological aid and comfort to boss McDonald. Kaiser, it is recalled, is a product of New Deal intervention into the business field. The late Jesse H. Jones, head of the RFC under Franklin D. Roosevelt, remarked, "There was one industrialist, Henry J. Kaiser, who was ready to try anything if the Government would put up the money. We helped him get into both magnesium and steel. . . ." Jones in his book *Fifty Billion Dollars* (Macmillan, 1951) related how the RFC loaned Kaiser $110 million to build the Fontana steel plant on the West Coast.

The Kaiser Company—friendly to the New and Fair Deals—found it easier to play footsie with the socialistic labor bosses than did the other steel masters who had to come up the hard way under the free enterprise system.

(2) Played down in most metropolitan newspapers was the fact that inflationary possibilities appeared in the Kaiser-USW settlement. Edgar F. Kaiser (son of Henry) of the Kaiser Company "concedes the new contract may force his company to raise prices," said the Scripps-Howard Washington *Daily News*, October 27. The rest of the steel firms in the companies' bargaining committee continued to lay emphasis on outlawing featherbedding and stuck to their fight against an inflationary settlement —in accordance with President Eisenhower's plea along that line.

(3) Another relic of the New Deal-Fair Deal epoch popped up in the court action on invoking the Taft-Hartley 80-day back-to-work procedure. In the three-man panel of the Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia, Judge William Hastie cast his verdict against sending the steelworkers back to work. Hastie was a well-known left-wing "liberal," holding various appointive positions under FDR and Truman; he was also a member of the ADA and the left-wing National Lawyers Guild. This background was not generally mentioned in the press.

Capitol Camera: State Department liquidation of the old Dulles team, which backstopped the late Secretary's stern fight against the rising tide of world communism, touched off last week's resignation of Undersecretary (for Political Affairs) Robert Murphy. Secretary of State Herter, long chafing against the Dulles philosophy, tried to "bury" Murphy (a staunch believer in Dulles' policies) by offering him the post of Ambassador to West Germany. Murphy, tired of the enclosing "appeasement" pressure, turned down the offer, chose to retire to private life. This is the inside version of Murphy's withdrawal—which remains unreported by the "liberal" claque of columnist pundits who have steadily promoted the appeasement-minded Ambassador Bohlen. The latter will now take virtual control of American foreign policy, under the guise of "special adviser" in the State Department. Bohlen's failures—at Teheran, Yalta, Moscow, Manila—have been frequently stressed in these columns. Other Dulles team members will soon leave.

● Secretary of the Treasury Anderson looms high on the Administration horizon as the defender of fiscal solvency and economy (like George Humphrey whom he succeeded). His demand for cuts in foreign aid has evidently had no little effect on Ike. It is recalled that some years ago Ike remarked he would like to number Anderson among his potential successors in the White House.

What isn't well known is that Anderson, in his efforts to save the dollar, is sternly rebuffing suggestions that the US should devalue its currency. These suggestions emanate, it is said, mainly from New York and British sources. The British would stand to gain by devaluation; the American people would suffer more from the consequent inflation. Some New York bankers—"the old Anglified J. P. Morgan influence"—want to play ball with London's financial community.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Typical of the appeasement swing in the State Department is the fact that State officials have ordered Voice of America and USIA to drop the terms "free world" and "free nations" to describe the anti-Communist and non-Communist nations—such as France, West Germany, Republic of China, etc.

● America is in the midst of a great technological revolution, warned President John Swearingen of Standard Oil of Indiana in a speech to oilmen in Kansas City. This revolution is impeded by labor boss efforts to prevent changes in work rules desired by management (as in the steel strike). President Swearingen warned: "If management surrenders its responsibility to manage, labor all too soon will lose its right to work."

● Steel's Mexican stand-off continues to render crushing blows to the Nation's economy and hardship on the families of a half million striking or laid off men, yet the Warren Court took a long weekend as the strike went into its 107th day, at a time when Court action was deemed imperative. Washington observers view with interest the difference between the Court's current temper regarding the crippling strike and its no-nonsense, midnight oil sessions when it overruled lower courts and state statutes in the school integration matter.

Nixon Vs Rockefeller: The New York Governor erred badly in his Chicago speech of October 21. The address was obviously planned as a very serious attempt to line up support in the Midwest, regarded as a strong center of pro-Nixon sentiment.

Rockefeller came out with two typical New Deal stands which left Chicagoland far from enthusiastic: (1) He plumped for maintenance of present high taxes; and (2) his remarks on foreign aid indicated that he wants more globaloney dispensed rather than less.

On these two issues, he collided sharply not only with Midwestern prejudices but also with a strong national feeling against the exactions of the tax-collector and the sending of our money wastefully and lavishly abroad. It made many Republicans still more dubious of the ability of Nelson—should he be nominated—to win the 1960 Presidential election.

He also managed, despite his array of public relations advisers, to cut a profile as a "provincial New Yorker." The Midwest pronounces Illinois, "Illinoy." Rockefeller said, "Illinoiz." It may seem a small thing, but this slip of the tongue has become a popular joke not only in Illinois—where the mistake means an automatic two strikes against a visitor—but generally west of the Appalachians. In any case, the New Yorker ran up no political mileage on his Chicago appearance.

Next and of great importance, the Rockefeller campaign seems to have abandoned—at least for the time being—earlier claims that "Nixon is a fine man but can't get elected." In his fencing with reporters at press conferences, the New York Governor reluctantly and indirectly admits that Nixon could win the Presidency. It may be that this shift in tactics arose from the report of the recent Gallup poll which queried both Republican and Democratic county chairmen as to whether Nixon would defeat Democratic frontrunner Senator John Kennedy if an election were held today. The poll came out as follows, with 3426 chairmen responding: Nixon would win—61 per cent; Kennedy would win—34 per cent; undecided—five per cent.

However, in the area of "organization," Rockefeller—according to all reports on Capitol Hill—appears to be forging ahead and Nixon to be lagging. The Vice President's failure to create a campaign organization nationally inspires many misgivings among his followers. From New Hampshire—where the first and perhaps most decisive primary will be held next March—a prominent, pro-Nixon publisher writes us deploring lack of organization work by Nixon forces and takes an uncertain view of the Vice President's chances in the March test. And elsewhere in the Nation, intense Rockefeller promotion among business leaders goes on, with the classical pattern of "wire-pulling" from big New York interests.

De Gaulle: The refusal by the French leader to attend a summit meeting until next spring (despite demands by Khrushchev, Macmillan and Eisenhower to hold it before the first of the year) has set in motion an agonizing re-appraisal among experts on Capitol Hill. It is felt that Ike and/or Secretary of State Herter have missed the boat by trailing along with British Prime Minister Macmillan's veritable obsession—another summit and the sooner the better. But the agonizing re-appraisal takes on wider scope in that it inspires lively dissent from the pro-British stand of not only Herter, but of all American foreign policy since the end of World War II—excepting, of course, the times when Secretary Dulles was able to prevail on the President to take a purely American course of action. (Dulles was thoroughly hated by the British press.)

Those in the Capital who take this critical point of view find confirmation in the study on Western Europe recently published by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—a work supervised by the eminent Professor Strausz-Hupe. The study criticizes the "preferred position" assigned Great Britain by American policy makers and emphasizes the resulting resentment engendered in Germany, France and Italy, with consequent "dangerous breaches" in the free world alliance against communism.

Diplomatic Row in Washington goes further. Veteran diplomats say that Britain now wants a weak and disarmed Germany and is prepared for almost any sell-out of Berlin. Furthermore, the British Foreign Office has taken alarm at the Franco-German rapprochement; indeed, its policy in the 19th century and up to the First World War was to keep France and Germany separated by the ancient grudge.

The chanceries of nations on the Continent of Europe make no bones about offering this analysis and add that Britain is again at its old policy of "divide and rule." Today, in face of the mortal Communist danger, this British policy threatens the security of the whole free world.

Thus, the rise in power of de Gaulle and his intransigence on the matter of the summit are not—to continental Europeans—evidence of the peculiarly stubborn personality of the French leader, but represent an expression of a self-protective coalition of European nations gathering under the leadership of "le grand Charles." Americans generously sprayed with propaganda from London

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fail to recognize this new situation (so ably described in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report).

Even today, few papers in the US have reported how stern has been the attitude of the French President, on the subject of the summit. (1) Among State Department circles it is reported that de Gaulle—in his private correspondence with President Eisenhower—has insisted that Khrushchev must repudiate any implication of another ultimatum on Berlin. (2) De Gaulle will have none but the Big Four at the spring summit; no East Germans, Czechs or other Communist satellites. As the French say—*c'est ca.*

STOP PRESS — reliable information just reaching HUMAN EVENTS says that Khrushchev wrote de Gaulle that his meeting with the latter should be held in Paris in November. The French President declined, saying he was too busy in November, but suggested a date late in December or early January. In conclusion, de Gaulle intimated that, if this later date were unacceptable to the Soviet dictator, perhaps the meeting should be cancelled.

Smearing The GOP: Washingtonians who read the ultra-"liberal" Washington *Post* were interested last week in the headline on Drew Pearson's column: "Report on Sen. Barrett Was Wrong." Pearson was retracting his attack on Senator Frank A. Barrett (R.-Wyo.) which appeared last year, five days before Barrett lost his Senate seat to Gale McGee by 1900 votes (out of 114,000 cast).

In that earlier column, Pearson asserted that Barrett had worked out an allegedly improper compromise with the Treasury Department in a tax case involving former GOP Senator E. V. Robertson of Wyoming. In return for this, said Pearson, Robertson contributed $500 to Barrett's campaign fund.

Sophisticated Washington dismissed the column as so much hot air—but it had a telling effect in Wyoming, as the unknown McGee managed to squeak in. The "liberal" McGee, in the view of Capital politicos, owed his election entirely to Pearson's column, which came too late for Barrett to prepare a documented denial to undo the damage—and another GOP Senator went down to defeat as "the people repudiated conservatism." (Or so the "liberals" would have Americans believe.)

Pearson apparently realized he was too far out on a limb and scrambled back to safety last week. Said Pearson magnanimously, "I now find that I was wrong. And, in fairness to Senator Barrett, I take this opportunity of setting the record straight and offering my sincere apologies. Senator Barrett has had a long career as a public servant . . . He has now taken the tough job of Counsel for the Department of Agriculture. Good luck to him in his new assignment."

Capitol Hill observers are impressed by the timing of this announcement—one year after the original column and the election, five years before McGee is up for re-election—by which time most people will have forgotten the shady circumstances of his first election. And, by that time, Senator Barrett, now 67, will be unlikely to attempt a political comeback—which means that another Pearson smear has accomplished its purpose and ended the career of a devoted public servant.

The South: "Liberal" National Chairman Paul Butler may be given the opportunity to prove his oft-repeated claim that the Democratic party doesn't need the conservative South in order to win the Presidency in 1960. For, in a weekly newsletter to his constituents, Senator Strom Thurmond (D.-S. C.) warns that "it is very important for the people of the South to be united and not committed to any candidate or party until we have had ample opportunity to determine what they are going to do for us—or what concerns me more—to us."

At a Southern Governors Conference, several weeks ago, South Carolina's Ernest Hollings advocated that the South follow an independent course of action in 1960, if necessary, rather than compromise its principles. Thurmond, the States Rights candidate who carried four states in 1948, endorses Hollings' thinking for these reasons:

"The South will never win any concessions by jumping in the bag in advance and staying there regardless of the radical views of the candidates or the bitter pills contained in the platforms. . . . Lack of Southern unity and determination in the past has contributed immeasurably to our present difficulties. In national politics, the bosses who pull the strings from backstage understand only power politics. Thus far the small minority groups have outplayed the biggest and most stepped-on minority group in this Nation—the people of the South. We must not permit this to continue."

Tale Of Two States: As Michigan returned to the fiscal chaos from which a use tax had temporarily rescued it, observers in the Nation's Capital contrasted the mess in the Wolverine State with the scene in Oklahoma—where a $40 million state public debt has been paid off since 1941, and where the state hasn't raised taxes since World War II.

Oklahoma's "secret" is simple: In 1941 the state approved a constitutional amendment prohibiting unbalanced budgets. As a result, while other states have spent and spent in line with the old Harry Hopkins formula, the Sooner State has kept the bureaucrats in line—Oklahoma is always forced, when budget requests zoom, to raise taxes or cut spending—rather than postpone facing the fiscal facts of life.

Important public buildings can be (and have been) financed by bond issues, so that legitimate needs are not endangered by the constitutional provision.

Says Washington: On Governor "Soapy" Williams' next trip out of the state, let him go to Oklahoma and see how the whole Michigan mess could have been avoided in the first place.

Public Power Junket: Three Democratic Senators touring the USSR's hydroelectric power plants have come to the same conclusion they could have reached in this country—namely, that Russia is out-producing the US in building hydroelectric plants.

HUMAN EVENTS reported on September 23 that Senators Ernest Gruening of Alaska, Frank Moss of Utah and Edmund Muskie of Maine were planning to spend the taxpayers' money to "study" Russian production of electricity from hydroelectric plants. All three are vehement public-power advocates, and could have been expected to ignore Interior Secretary Fred Seaton's testimony that the US does not have to depend on hydroelectric power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a source of electricity to anything like the extent that the USSR must. Consequently, Washington has not been surprised at Gruening's Moscow statement that the USSR is outbuilding the US in hydroelectric projects, and the Capital asks, "What else is new?"

Skepticism is also expressed here at Gruening's statement that he had been told a Red Chinese dam on the Yangtze River would produce twelve times the electricity generated by Grand Coulee Dam. The Nation's Capital recalls that it, too, has been told of Chinese Communist achievements—all those backyard steel furnaces, for instance—and it is still waiting to see them.

New Party: Two hundred men and women met in Chicago October 23-24 and organized the "National Federation of Independent State Parties." Two state organizations, the Conservative party of New Jersey and the States' Rights party of Louisiana, were admitted to the Federation.

Other "new parties" will be admitted after they get on the ballot in their states and meet other Federation specifications. When 13 state parties qualify, the "Temporary Self-Dissolving Committee"—of which A. G. Heinsohn, Jr., of Sevierville, Tennessee, is treasurer—will be automatically dissolved.

Taxes: "An America grown sick of heavy taxes, increasingly sore at big spending by government—Federal, state, county, city, schools." Such is the key impression of contemporary America recorded by veteran Scripps-Howard reporter Charles Lucey at the conclusion of a recent coast-to-coast swing across the United States.

"It's not a revolt—yet," says Lucey. "But it's doubtful if there's been as much angry grumbling about taxes since the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794."

Coupled with the growing resentment against taxes is a keen new awareness of the dangers of inflation. The American people, reports Lucey, "see more plainly that having more cash is meaningless if it buys no more goods."

Lucey relates these candid tax and inflation comments from people throughout the country:

- The mayor of Bloomington, Illinois, said that people are not griping about any one tax—but taxes in general. "It's the first thing people talk of. . . . We're supposed to be in prosperous times, but I think people are angry because money is so scarce with all these taxes."
- "Most folks haven't been aware of hidden taxes," observed a business woman in Ohio, "but I can tell you they are today."
- A state legislator in Spokane, Washington, noted that the state sales tax was upped to four per cent and "everyone's unhappy." Residents of Spokane also face a new business and occupation tax. "But the people complain about all taxes—national spending and foreign spending," concluded the legislator.
- A cattle feeder in Iowa said that "taxes have come to be ridiculous. We all want good schools but it seems to me they're going to extremes. In one year my taxes jumped $400-$500. They can tax a man to where there's no incentive. Maybe it's better just to rent and let someone else carry the responsibility."

Editorializing on the Lucey findings and other evidences of tax resentment, the Washington *Daily News* said last week: ". . . we suspect that the current state of anger over high taxes will take concrete form—probably in rejecting from office those officials the public holds responsible. . . .

"Public officials who find it necessary to spend the money requiring higher taxes had better have an excellent reason, and be able to sell their public."

A Good Question: A New York *Daily News* reader noted last week that the sanctified goddess of leftism. Eleanor Roosevelt, invited Nikita Khrushchev to the moral tobacco road of Hyde Park and is now plugging Red Chinese UN admission.

Queried the reader: "Whose side is she on, anyway?" Answer: "Democracy's" side, of course, meaning a world in which we are all so equal that individual liberty vanishes.

Book Event: Due to a mistaken idea that the US and the Soviet Union could cooperate after World War II. Franklin D. Roosevelt sacrificed a large part of Europe at the Yalta conference, asserts French President de Gaulle in a book of wartime memoirs published last week, entitled *Le Salut* (Salvation).

Reports from Paris say the volume is packed with intimate revelations and much inside history, such as a letter which de Gaulle, then leader of the Free French forces, received in May, 1945, from Heinrich Himmler. Hitler's Gestapo chief. Himmler warned the French leader that if he leaned on the "Anglo-Saxons," they would treat him like a satellite. If de Gaulle went along with the Russians—Himmler added—the latter would communize France and liquidate the general. The German Secret Service head suggested that the only way France could attain greatness and independence was through an understanding with vanquished Germany. De Gaulle, in his memoirs, says he did not answer the Himmler letter but adds that Himmler's look into the future undoubtedly contained elements of truth.

REV. HERBERT BREWSTER, Congregational Church, Kealia, Kauai, Hawaii: "HUMAN EVENTS I count one of my many blessings . . . It saves me a great deal of time and contains the essence of what is going on in Washington — and proves to be so very often absolutely correct in its analysis. For the great lift you have given me, Mahalo nui ka kou (Thank you very much)."

REV. EDWIN R. COWAN, Trinity United Presbyterian Church, Tacoma, Wash.: "I appreciate the candid, open and frank facing of vital issues with factual background not available through ordinary sources."

REV. ROBERT E. ALLTEN, Orono Methodist Church, Orono, Maine: "My own political and theological convictions are strengthened by the reading of HUMAN EVENTS. It is a valuable tool in my study and enables me to interpret more intelligently for my 503 regular attenders."

REV. GLENN A. ROBERSON, Church of the Nazarene, Coolidge, Ariz.: "HUMAN EVENTS is of great value to me in keeping up with the events of the world. I appreciate the gift subscription very much."

REV. J. FOY JOHNSON, First Assembly of God Church, Lakeland, Fla.: "In my opinion there is no newsletter or periodical that brings to the attention of the busy pastor so much helpful information on the inside activities of our national affairs. I appreciate its scholarly approach so much."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 44 HUMAN EVENTS November 4, 1959

ARTICLE SECTION

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

What Can We Do About the Spoiled Generation?

By VIRGINIA HELD

THERE HAS PROBABLY NEVER BEEN a moment in history when adults were not shocked by what they regarded as an unprecedented wave of bad behavior among children and adolescents. But in our time reports of gang warfare in the streets, teen-age muggings, and senseless killings have turned shock to cold fear.

Juvenile delinquency, particularly in the United States, has come to be considered one of the most urgent social problems of the day, and the epidemic of arrogance and crime seems to be spreading so fast that it obliterates the best efforts society can make to control it—or even to understand it.

There are two major ways of measuring juvenile delinquency statistically. One is to count the number of cases handled by juvenile courts throughout the country; this is done by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The other is to count the (quite different) number of police arrests of young people; this is done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. By either measure, juvenile delinquency is increasing.

Of course, statistics can be misleading. Definitions both of who a juvenile is and of what constitutes delinquency vary widely from state to state and even from court to court. And as Earl Raab and Gertrude Jaeger Selznick have pointed out in their book *Major Social Problems*: "A rising rate of delinquency may reflect an increase in the willingness of adults to place juveniles under court jurisdiction. Delinquency figures represent delinquency acts *reported*. Their increase may mean more delinquency, but it also may mean more avid reporting. For example, police, parent, and neighbor attitudes may influence the extent to which they are willing to report delinquent acts. As urban neighborhoods, especially in slum areas, become less cohesive, less homogeneous, and less marked by community feeling, we may expect people to be less indulgent and less protective." Both the press and the public are certainly paying more attention to the conduct of teen-agers than they used to, and there would seem to be a distinct possibility that the FBI's category of "miscellaneous violations of state and local laws" has been swelled with a number of cases that would once have been called youthful pranks but are now classified as "J. D."

But even after statistical inflation has been discounted, most experts in the field are convinced that the recent simultaneous increases in court cases and police arrests represent a real social trend that society can ignore only at its own peril. Above all, there is no blinking the fact that serious crimes by juveniles, such as burglary and assault, have increased greatly in the past few years.

From 1948 through 1957, the latest year for which complete figures are available, juvenile-court cases increased 136 per cent while the under-17 population increased only 27 per cent. According to FBI statistics, from 1948 through 1957 recorded arrests of persons under 18 multiplied eight times; there were seven times as many arrests for assaults, four times as many for burglaries, and eight times as many for thefts. And in the last five years, juvenile arrests for murder and non-accidental killings have increased more than two and a half times. In 1948, persons under 18 were held responsible for 4.2 per cent of all crimes; in 1957 for 12.3 per cent.

What a number of people who deal with juvenile delinquents find even more disturbing than the increase in the number and savagery of the offenses in the fact that more and more of the young people who get into trouble seem to act without understandable motive or provocation, and to feel no noticeable guilt for what they have done. Destruction for the sheer joy of destroying erupts in the most surprising places. In prosperous Maplewood, New Jersey, a gang of boys broke into the junior high school, wrecked classrooms, poured kerosene over library books, and set the school ablaze, causing $300,000 worth of damage. During a three-month period there were six less costly but similar outbreaks of vandalism in relatively prosperous New York suburbs.

The number of childern and teen-agers who senselessly murder close family members is also increasing. After killing his mother, father, and brother, an 18-year-old Massachusetts boy said it never would have happened if his parents had let him spend his $150 savings on a car.

ONE RECURRING IDEA is that poverty causes delinquency. And yet several studies were made in the 1940's—notably one by Lowell Carr and another by David Bogan—which showed that delinquency rates decrease in periods of widespread unemployment and increase in periods of prosperity.

Another diagnosis blames over-crowding and bad housing. And yet the middle-class suburbs are certainly not without their share of trouble and there is ample evidence that many a human slum festers behind the smooth exteriors of the new low-cost housing projects, which often breed their own gangs and have above average delinquency rates.

Still another theory focuses on bad neighborhoods, considered in terms of inhabitants and mores rather than in terms of bricks and mortar. The map of New York's Youth Board Services reveals that the most troubled areas are those with high concentrations of new immigrants and the poor. But even so, there is no getting around the fact that for every slum child who becomes a delinquent a great many do not; the theory does not help to explain the operation of crucial factors within the individual.

Still another theory, whose validity is accepted with varying degrees of emphasis by most experts in the field, puts the blame on broken homes. But an impressive study made by Harvard's Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck makes it clear that the way a child's parents treat him is more important than the way they treat each other.

At present the most popular theory about juvenile delinquency seems to be that it is caused by psychiatric disturbance. Not only psychiatrists but a vast number of

This is an abridgment of an article which appeared in the August 20, 1959 edition of *The Reporter* magazine and is printed here with permission of the publishers and the author.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. — Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social workers, teachers, and laymen tend to feel that any boy who gets into trouble is the victim of uncontrollable forces within himself and is above all in need of psychiatric help. Yet the Gluecks found that only seven per cent of the 500 delinquents they studied had any marked psychopathic tendencies, and they found far fewer neurotics among the delinquents than among a similar number of nondelinquents.

But even if it could be proved that poverty and slum conditions had nothing whatever to do with juvenile delinquency, it is only natural that society's greatest sympathy and concern should be focused on the unfortunate children who have to grow up in the crowded squalor of our big cities. Twenty-seven per cent of the people of Manhattan are in rooming houses, often paying $100 a month for the privilege of living four, five, or six in a single room, with a toilet in the hall that may or may not be in working order. Little children are left to their own devices out on the streets late at night because their parents are sitting on their beds. Older children have nowhere to study and usually no one to commend them if they manage to make good marks. Instead of being under the watchful eye of a minister or teacher or relative, they are transients in decaying neighborhoods where "I don't see nothin'" is the one cardinal rule and where racial friction frequently breaks out into violence.

The family life of many city children is scarcely conducive to good behavior. In a group of 20,000 "multi-problem" families known to the New York City Youth Board, 27 per cent of the fathers are drug addicts or alcoholics, 16 per cent of the mothers are mentally ill, 28 per cent of the fathers have deserted their families, twelve per cent of the mothers have abused their children by beatings or cruelty.

One official I talked to about juvenile delinquency in New York said that, after all, large numbers of extremely primitive people are pouring into our cities and one can't expect too much from them. And yet it sometimes seems as if it takes two or three years of living in one of our big cities to make newcomers really primitive. The delinquency rate in Puerto Rico is extremely low, about two per thousand compared to Manhattan's 50 per thousand, and East Harlem's 76.

One of the most ambitious programs to help city children make the best of their environment has been planned for New York's Lower East Side. Called "Mobilization for Youth," its purpose is to saturate the district for six years with the best that city and private agencies can offer in social work and recreational facilities as well as psychological, psychiatric, and welfare services. The effectiveness of the program will be carefully evaluated and the results should show pretty clearly whether juvenile delinquency can be controlled by any appreciable degree by merely increasing the kinds of services we tried in the past—or whether they must be supplemented by some radically new approaches to the problem.

The roots of juvenile delinquency apparently run very deep, and while conceding that society must do all it can to meet desperate needs through such programs as "Mobilization for Youth," a number of thoughtful people who have worked with juvenile delinquents are coming to feel that society might do well to re-examine some of its basic assumptions about preventing delinquency.

IT HAS FREQUENTLY BEEN ASSERTED that delinquent childen feel unwanted and insecure and that these feelings drive them into antisocial behavior. The Gluecks, however, found that among the group they studied, feelings of being unwanted and unloved, and tendencies toward insecurity and anxiety were even more prevalent among the nondelinquents than among the delinquents. There is obviously some value in each of the various specific theories that have been advanced to explain what causes juvenile delinquency, but it seems pretty clear that no one of them provides all the answers.

It is generally agreed that the most comprehensive scientific study of the importance that can be ascribed to various social, psychological, and physical factors in the make-up of juvenile delinquents is that which has been provided in recent years by the Gluecks. Working with a staff of anthropologists, psychiatrists, physicians, social workers, and statisticians, Professor Glueck and his wife compared 500 persistently delinquent boys with 500 nondelinquent ones. The two groups were matched as closely as possible by age (eleven to 17), ethnic derivation (mostly English, Italian, and Irish), general intelligence, and residence in underprivileged urban neighborhoods with high delinquency rates.

The Gluecks found that the tendency toward delinquency appears remarkably early in a boy's life: 48 per cent of the delinquents start to misbehave persistently when they are seven years old or less, another 39 per cent when eight to ten years old.

The Gluecks also discovered that they could predict delinquency with considerable accuracy. By a complicated weighted scoring of parents' answers to a list of questions about how they act in certain situations, they evaluate the following five elements of a pre-school child's life: affection of mother for boy, affection of father for boy, supervision of boy by mother, discipline of boy by father, and cohesiveness of family. The New York City Youth Board used the Glueck prediction table for 220 five-and-a-half to six-and-a-half-year-old boys entering the city's schools and was able to predict with 89 per cent accuracy which ones would become school behavior problems four years later.

Useful as the Glueck's table is, of course it does not explain what causes juvenile delinquency.

A number of factors, notably the possession of a muscular physique and a high energy output, were found to be important, and in general the studies the Gluecks have completed so far would seem to indicate that juvenile delinquency is not caused by any single factor in and of itself but results from the interaction of various social processes with the biological and psychological make-up of individuals. During the last few years there has been a good deal less emphasis placed on single cure-alls for juvenile delinquency by the private and public agencies that are concerned with the problem. A more modest pluralism has replaced nearly all vestiges of fanaticism for unequivocal theories, and new approaches are constantly being tried in order to make use of a variety of interdependent techniques.

One such experiment is pavement-pounding social work. The New York City Youth Board found that about one-quarter of the families producing delinquents were producing about three-quarters of them. These families were often the ones given up as "hopeless" by most social agencies: they were too far gone to ask an agency for assistance and too unreliable to keep appointments with the social workers in the agency's office. The new approach is to go out and find them, persuade them to accept assistance, and try to help the children before they get into trouble. "Reaching" has become the Youth Board's slogan.

ONE OF THE MOST OUTSPOKEN among those who would like to see a number of changes take place in current thinking about the needs of children is Dr. Melitta Schmideberg, director of the Association for the Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Schmideberg emphasizes that each society must expect the crimes that are tolerated or sometimes even encouraged by popular attitudes. Punishing the few individuals who have actually committed an offense has far less effect than the way society in general disapproves of and suppresses the very idea of a particular crime.

In the last year for which the figures are available, there were 133 arrests of children under 18 in the United States for murder and nonaccidental killing. Dr. Schmideberg notes that the comparable figures for European countries are a great deal smaller, and in some civilizations homicide committed by children is practically unheard of.

Perhaps, she suggests, our delinquency rates are increasing because our society simply does not sufficiently abhor and disapprove of the many acts of violence, brutality, theft, and destruction in which its youth indulges.

Dr. Schmideberg has made a study of child murderers in this country and points out that in recent years a number of disturbing cases have appeared: children in what would appear to be model homes who have murdered members of their immediate family, often their parents, and who show little emotion and almost no remorse about the deed; the provocation has in most cases been quite trifling, but sometimes the murder has been carefully planned and prepared.

"Most psychiatrists who have studied child murderers," Dr. Schmideberg told me, "do not feel able to explain their mentality adequately. While they are obviously not normal, it is too glib merely to call them 'sick,' 'psychopathic,' or 'schizophrenic.'" She feels that many of the young offenders have simply never acquired a sense of the wrongness of cruelty and brutality and that what has pushed them into crime has often been not an uncontrollable impulse but simply an uncontrolled one.

In sympathizing with the agony of the young offender, Dr. Schmideberg argues, we fail to realize that a growing number experience no agony at all. The attempt to provide humane treatment and psychiatric therapy for delinquents has sometimes had the unfortunate side effect of leading them to take their offenses lightly.

"A fifteen-year-old boy came here the other day," Dr. Schmideberg told me, "with a handful of clippings that said delinquency is the fault of the parents, and that parents should talk with and try to understand their children. He said his parents didn't understand him, so it wasn't his fault that he held up a store." Another delinquent blamed his mother, saying she was impossibly neurotic: she made him straighten up his room. "One would like to simply laugh at these cases," Dr. Schmideberg said, "but one can't, because they have unfortunately become quite typical."

Dr. Schmideberg feels that our society has allowed itself to be dominated by its children to a dangerous degree. "Every generation rebels against the preceding one and is only too prone to see its faults. We have been too ready to see in Victorian restrictions and inhibitions the cause of all neuroses and almost all the ills against which we try to protect our children. By now the problem is the very opposite. While the demands on the parent and teacher—to be fair, consistent, patient, and tolerant—have been increasing, the demands on the child have been lowered to such a degree he grows up without adequate conscience, self-control, or will power. He is extremely self-centered, and takes quite reasonable restraint or reprimand as an affront."

PUNISHMENT has become highly unpopular during the last few generations. But Dr. Schmideberg thinks that since children are not born with an innate appreciation of good conduct they have to acquire it through learning, and she approves, as an aid in teaching them, of "justified and moderate punishment—including spanking—by both parents and teachers." (Of course she adds that the indiscriminate and groundless beatings some parents give their children can produce far worse results than permissiveness.)

Another person whose extensive experience with young delinquents has led him to be concerned about present attitudes toward children and adolescents in this country is Judge Peter T. Farrell. A senior and administrative judge of Queens County Court in New York, Judge Farrell handles what are known as "youthful offenders." In New York, juvenile courts deal with children up to only 16 years. But between the ages of 16 and 19, a youngster brought to court can be, and nearly always is, given a "youthful offender" status; he must have a lawyer, but he is tried without a jury (as are juvenile delinquents); If found guilty, he is convicted as a youthful offender, not as a criminal; and if he is later asked on an application blank whether he has ever been convicted of a crime, his answer can be "NO." Youthful offenders are generally put on probation.

Judge Farrell submits that "there has developed in our society the idea that misconduct is always abnormal, and what the law calls crime is to be explained largely in terms of causes beyond the control of the criminal. The philosophy of responsibility has been replaced by the philosophy of excuse . . . . The philosophy of excuse has for a generation, in my opinion, undermined the moral, the legal, and the social responsibilities upon which the stability of our culture must repose. The linking of misbehavior to the maladjustments and to forces beyond the control of the individual offender may frequently be justified but not so often as to warrant a general philosophy of law which has lost sight of the normal standards of individual responsibility and of personal freedom . . . . Responsibility should be the universal norm, and excuse the challenged exception."

The probation officers in Judge Farrell's department don't hesitate to instruct a boy under their surveillance in such practical matters as how to spend his time and his money, what places and people to stay away from, and what standards of behavior he is required to maintain. And always behind the probation officer's directions is the authority of the court.

Eighty-five per cent of the boys Judge Farrell puts on probation have no further trouble with the law, a much higher rate of success than can be claimed by most programs. A program for psychiatric treatment in three cities was considered successful in being able to keep half of its boys from reverting to crime within two years.

The rising level of youthful misbehavior in our schools is a matter of deep concern to Emil Tron, president of the New York High School Teachers Association. To illustrate the current conditions under which teachers must work, he cites the case of a teacher who showed a boy who was causing a disturbance at a basketball game to the door; the next day the teacher was charged with assault and battery and forced to defend himself in court. Mr. Tron feels that there must be a change from the current situation in which school children feel immune from punishment and teachers helpless to maintain order. He and a growing number of other teachers believe that many children lack respect not because they are seriously disturbed or because the teacher is unworthy but because teachers have been prevented from using even minimal authority.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A teacher who had been sent sprawling to the floor by one of his students told a reporter for the *New York World Telegram* that school authorities don't look kindly on a teacher who hurts a student, even in self-defense. Such a teacher is unlikely ever to receive a higher license.

A wry saying has been making the rounds in public schools recently to the effect that, "The teachers are afraid of the principal, the principal is afraid of the supervisor, the supervisor is afraid of the parents and the PTA, and the parents are afraid of their kids. The kids, they ain't afraid of nobody."

THE MANY MISINTERPRETATIONS of child psychology that affect popular attitudes in this country today are a source of deep concern to Dr. Marjorie Rittwagen, a staff psychiatrist for New York City's children's courts. Dr. Rittwagen considers that there are four main causes of delinquency. About the first two—neglectful, disturbed parents and crowded neighborhoods with shifting populations—there is much awareness, though often a sad lack of facilities for treatment. But about the third and fourth major causes—the schools and the frightening absence of any beliefs and values among so many children—there is not even much awareness.

Dr. Rittwagen told me that she has seen modern educational methods, devised for well-behaved children who were eager to learn, only serve to turn many schools into shambles. In high-delinquency areas the children who wield control are the most aggressive and destructive, those who are able to terrorize their classmates into accepting their own distorted values. In some schools, says, Dr. Rittwagen, it is "physically dangerous for a school child to try to behave and learn."

The tendency not to blame children for their misconduct is apparently matched by an equally pervasive tendency among adults to blame somebody else for not instilling in children, before they get in trouble, the sense of values and civilized behavior they desperately need. The producers of TV programs, comics, movies, and newspaper stories which suggest that violence and brutality are acceptable and ordinary say they are only turning out what the public wants. The social workers and psychiatrists proceed on the assumption that it is not their job to meddle with cultural and ethical values—which they assume the child already possesses. The teachers say they are already overburdened trying to teach reading and arithmetic, and it is up to the churches and parents to take care of manners and morals. But the churches' influence, to whatever extent they actually can teach children how to behave, is limited at best: a priest in an average Manhattan neighborhood estimates that less than a quarter of the children there are even remotely touched by religion. And the parents, even if they are not overwhelmed by their own problems as not to care, are usually hard pressed to know what values they themselves respect. In sum: almost no one seems willing and able to instill, simply and directly, a basic understanding of the difference between right and wrong.

The irony in all this is that children are obviously quick to learn what anyone takes the trouble to teach them. Over and over in talking with people who work with delinquents, I have been told that all children today are extremely conscious of their rights; they know all about them and they assert and insist on them. Our children have learned at least one lesson quite thoroughly: they know all about what society owes them. Apparently a lesson that hasn't been taught, at least so far, is what they owe society.

ARTICLE 4

The police department of Houston, Texas, has issued a leaflet called "Twelve Rules for Raising Delinquent Children."

1. Begin with infancy to give the child everything he wants. In this way he will grow up to believe the world owes him a living.

2. *When he picks up bad words, laugh at him. This will make him think he's cute. It will also encourage him to pick up "cuter" phrases that will blow off the top of your head later.*

3. Never give him any spiritual training. Wait until he is 21 and then let him "decide for himself."

4. *Avoid use of the word "wrong." It may develop a guilt complex. This will condition him to believe later, when he is arrested for stealing a car, that society is against him and he is being persecuted.*

5. Pick up everything he leaves lying around—books, shoes, and clothes. Do everything for him so that he will be experienced in throwing all responsibility on others.

6. *Let him read any printed matter he can get his hands on. Be careful that the silver-ware and drinking glasses are sterilized, but let his mind feast on garbage.*

7. Quarrel frequently in the presence of your children. In this way they will not be too shocked when the home is broken up later.

8. *Give a child all the spending money he wants. Never let him earn his own. Why should he have things as tough as you had them?*

9. Satisfy his every craving for food, drink, and comfort. See that every sensual desire is gratified. Denial may lead to harmful frustration.

10. *Take his part against neighbors, teachers, policemen. They are all prejudiced against your child.*

11. When he gets into real trouble, apologize for yourself by saying, "I never could do anything for him."

12. *Prepare for a life of grief. You will be likely to have it.*

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "WHAT CAN WE DO WITH THE SPOILED GENERATION" at $ _____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED